

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Bureau of Agricultural Economics

X
REPORT ON GROCERS' REACTIONS TO AND PARTICIPATION IN THE
BANNER BUY PROGRAM X

JUNE 1949
WASHINGTON, D. C.

USDA
LIB

1000
1000

723656
CONTENTS AND SUMMARY

	Page
INTRODUCTION-----	1
THE SAMPLE-----	1
I. KNOWLEDGE AND OPINIONS REGARDING THE BANNER BUY FOOD PROGRAM.	
How many grocers participated in the program?----- Seven out of ten of the York and Lancaster grocers participated	2
Who were the participants?----- Larger stores and chain stores were more likely to be among the participants than small or independent stores	3
How did retailers hear of the program?----- Almost all of the grocers said that the wholesalers or the wholesalers' salesmen told them about the program. Proportionately more of those who participated than of those who did not said they heard about the program from official sources.	4
How satisfied were retailers with the amount of information they received?----- Eight out of ten said they got as much information as they wanted about the program. Participants were more satisfied than non-participants with the amount of information they received.	5
What did grocers know of the program's purposes?----- Most of them knew the food conservation and/or anti- inflationary purposes of the Banner Buy Food Program. Parti- cipants, as a group, were better informed about the program's purposes than non-participants.	6
How successful did grocers think the program?----- A fifth thought it was a success. Twice as many said it was a failure.	7
How grocers measured the program's success----- Those who thought it helped their business were more likely to consider the Banner Buy a successful program than those who didn't.	8
Those who thought their customers were interested were more likely to consider the program successful than those who thought their customers were not interested.	

II. EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE BANNER BUY FOOD PROGRAM

- How many grocers used the advertising materials?----- 11
Eight out of ten or more participants used the Banner Buy posters, the recipe-book posters, and placards. Less than half used the distributed leaflets and booklets - which were received by only about one-half of the grocers in the program. Only 8 percent used all of the advertising materials and prepared special displays as well.
- How widely was the banner used?----- 16
Nine out of ten grocers reported that they bannered some foods during the campaign. The four foods most frequently bannered were, canned citrus juice, canned peas, white potatoes, and canned tomato products.
- Many grocers reported that they used the banner for foods which were not on the official list.
- How effective was the program in increasing sales of bannered foods?----- 17
Two-thirds of those who used the banner reported they had increased sales of bannered foods. Lowered prices of bannered foods appear to have helped in increasing their sales.

REPORT ON GROCERS' REACTIONS TO AND PARTICIPATION IN THE BANNER BUY PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

This survey is one of two surveys that were conducted in Pennsylvania under the title of Banner Buy Program. The other studied consumers' reactions to the program. Both were conducted by the Division of Special Surveys, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, for the Office of Food and Feed Conservation of this Department in the spring and early summer of 1948. The major purpose of the survey here reported was to learn retailers' reactions to the program which was tried out by the Office of Food and Feed Conservation in cooperation with local authorities and business men in York and Lancaster Counties. The program took place during the latter half of May and all of June 1948. Its basic purpose, authorized by Public Law 395, 80th Congress, was to increase the consumption of plentiful foods as this would probably reduce the demand for relatively scarce foods and so tend to ease the inflationary pressures on commodities.

The following features were included in the Banner Buy Food Program which was designed to meet the basic purpose.

Lists were made of the plentiful foods. These lists included nationally, not necessarily locally, surplus foods.

USDA officials met with the wholesalers and chain-store executives in York and Lancaster Counties and received assurance of their cooperation in making contact with all the retail stores in their communities.

Retailers were given the lists of plentiful foods and asked to feature these foods as they thought advisable.

At the same time the wholesalers in the program provided the retailers with:
Posters advertising the campaign
Banners to mark the individually featured plentiful foods
Posters advertising a recipe book "Money-Saving Main Dishes".

Later during the campaign, through the same channels, retailers were provided with other advertising materials.

Meanwhile, news articles about the campaign and its progress were published in local papers and advertised on the radio. Stores were asked to mention the campaign in their newspaper advertising.

THE SAMPLE

The universe sampled was all the grocery stores in the following towns and cities:

In York County: York, Red Lion, and Hanover

In Lancaster County: Lancaster, Elizabethtown, Ephrata, and Columbia

These communities were the ones which were selected, by random sampling, to provide a sample of urban households in York and Lancaster Counties. The sample

of households was used for the companion report -- dealing with homemakers' reactions to the program. The method of selecting grocery stores was as follows:

Trade lists of all the stores in the seven sample communities were obtained and checked for completeness and accuracy with local businessmen and officials.

As the total number of chain stores and supermarkets was small and their relative volume of business great, all of their local units were included in the sample.

Independent stores were randomly selected so that the number of stores in the sample for each community is proportional to the number of households selected for the companion household survey.

Interviewing for this survey began on July 21 -- 3 weeks after the end of the campaign -- and ended on August 3.

One out of ten of the grocers originally selected for the sample said that he had never heard of the Banner Buy Food Program. Interviewers had been instructed to make one attempt to substitute for the grocers who had not heard of it. They were asked to visit the store that was listed immediately under the one originally selected. If the proprietor or manager of the substitute establishment had also not heard of the program no further substitution was permitted. More than half of the grocers who hadn't heard of it were in Hanover in York County. It was found that most of the grocery stores in this community were served by local wholesalers who had not taken part in setting up the program. In the communities that were served by York and Lancaster wholesalers -- including the cities of York and Lancaster -- only 4 percent of the grocers had not heard of the program. Field reports about these grocers indicate that they had small grocery enterprises -- often part of a general store or some kind of specialty store with limited lines of foods.

KNOWLEDGE AND OPINIONS REGARDING THE BANNER BUY FOOD PROGRAM

How Many Grocers Participated in the Program?

Seven out of ten York and Lancaster County grocers said that they took part in the Banner Buy Food Program. Their answers to the question, "Did this store ever take part in the Banner Food Program?", are shown:

<u>Grocers who said they:</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Took part in the program	72
Did not take part in the program	18
Did not hear of the program	<u>10</u>
Total	100
Number of grocers <u>1/</u>	210

1/ Interviews were not taken with grocers who said they had not heard of the program and substitutions were made for some of them (see Sample statement). The number of grocers interviewed was 199 and all tables in the body of this report are based on this sample of grocers interviewed.

Who Were The Participants?

In comparison with those who did not take part, the participants tended to be the owners or managers of the larger grocery enterprises. Proportionally, more chain stores and stores with large gross weekly sales are included among the participants than among the non-participants.

Owners or managers of large grocery enterprises were more likely than small shopkeepers to have taken part. Proportionally, more chain than independent stores took part. Independent cooperative stores (stores individually owned but banded together and purchasing as a unit) were also more likely than independents to have taken part.

	Type of store		
	Chain	Independent-cooperative	Independent
	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Participants	92	87	73
Non-participants	<u>8</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>27</u>
Total	100	100	100
Number of grocers	48	54	95

Chains were more likely than independent stores to have large gross weekly sales. Comparing them by income, stores with weekly gross sales of \$500 or over were more likely to have taken part than those with smaller incomes.

Two-thirds of the grocers who were not in the program were independents and almost half of them averaged less than \$500 worth of weekly sales. Non-participants' answers to the question, "Would you please tell me why you did not take part in the program?" indicate that many had made no choice. Twenty-one out of the thirty-nine non-participants said they had not been told of it nor asked to take part. Six went on to say that they did not belong to any wholesale group and so were excluded from the program. The remaining grocers who didn't take part said that they weren't interested in it, did not have time for it, or expressed some antagonism toward it -- dislike of the leaders, their motives, or the program's purpose. These two quotations are from interviews with independent grocers who have very small businesses.

"I don't bother with things like that. In fact I don't know what it's all about. It could have been on the radio or in the papers for all I know. I haven't had time to pay any attention."

"My husband is ill and I can't keep up with all the things that are suggested. I read the plan but put all the posters, etc., aside because I don't have the time and my store is so small it would not help me along anyway."

How did Retailers Hear of the Program?

Almost all of the grocers who had heard of the program had been notified by their wholesalers or wholesalers' salesmen. This was the major source of information about it and, for about half of the grocers, the best source.

The relative effectiveness of the sources of information was measured in three ways:: First, spontaneous recall, by using the question "How did you hear about the Banner Food Program?"; second, recognition, by asking for each source not already mentioned by the grocer, "Did you get any information about it from (special meeting, radio, etc.)?"; third, evaluation, by asking "Which of these sources would you say gave you the most information about the program?". Table 3 summarizes the responses to the three kinds of questions.

<u>Source</u>	Spontaneous	Recognition	Evaluation-
	recall	in addition to	most
	Percent ^{1/}	spontaneous recall Percent ^{1/}	information Percent
#Wholesaler or salesman	63	94	48
Newspaper	33	84	16
#USDA official or official letter	10	24	6
Radio	7	45	3
#Special meeting	7	20	6
Trade paper	3	34	1
#Trade association	3	20	3
#Store owner or supervisor	3	<u>2/</u>	3
Friends	2	26	1
Other stores	1	18	--
Customers	1	<u>2/</u>	1
Newsreels	--	3	--
Cannot select among sources	--	--	11
Not ascertained	7	--	<u>1</u>
Number of grocers		199	100

^{1/} Percentages add to more than 100 for many heard of the program from more than one source.

^{2/} These sources were not included on the checklist. The question to determine recognition, therefore, was not asked.

The newsreels were not used as a medium of information. No one spontaneously mentioned that he learned about the program from newsreels but 3 percent, when asked about them, said that they had seen something about the program in the movies. All these grocers, who were participants, knew considerable about the program and reported having heard of it from many sources other than the newsreels.

Sources marked in table 3 with a signal (#) are designated in the following table as the official ones. They are the ones through which it was planned that all grocers in York and Lancaster would get information. The remaining sources were informal and non-official so far as retailers were concerned. As would be expected, participants were more likely to say their contact had been through official channels than were non-participants.

Grocers who spontaneously recalled that they heard about the program from:	Participants	Non Participants	All grocers
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Official sources only	61	18	53
Official and non-official	26	13	24
Non-official sources only	7	54	16
Not ascertained	6	15	7
Total	100	100	100
Number of grocers	160	39	199

Half of the non-participants recalled only such sources as the radio, newspapers, other retailers, friends, or customers -- all of them informal and none of them equipped to provide the materials for taking part in the program. A tenth of the grocers who took part in the program remembered only non-official sources.

How Satisfied were Retailers with the Amount of Information They Received?

Eight out of ten grocers were satisfied with the information they received about the program. The question was "Did you get all the information about the program that you wanted or would you have liked more?"

Said they:	Participants	Non Participants	All grocers
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Got all the information they wanted	91	40	80
Would have liked more information	9	1/53	1/18
Uncertain or not ascertained	--	7	2
Total	100	100	100
Number of grocers	160	39	199

1/ Includes 8 percent of the non-participants (1 percent of all grocers) who said they didn't get any information about the program.

Since lack of information was often given as the reason for non-participation, it is not surprising that a relatively large proportion of grocers who weren't in the program expressed dissatisfaction with the information they had. Nine out of ten of the participants and only four out of ten of the non-participants expressed satisfaction with the information they had received.

What did Grocers Know of the Program's Purposes?

Knowledge of the program's purposes was widespread among the grocers in York and Lancaster Counties -- less so among the non-participants, however, than among the grocers who took part.

Question: "As you see it, what were the purposes of the Banner Food Program?"

	Participants	Non Participants	All grocers
Said that the program's purpose was:	Percent 1/	Percent 1/	Percent 1/
To sell more plentiful foods and/or conserve scarce foods	81	38	73
Reduce cost of living; cut prices; save housewives' money	18	10	17
Educate housewives--either nutri- tionally or economically	8	3	7
Assist special groups	6	10	7
Help wholesalers get rid of un- wanted stocks			
Help producers of certain brands			
Increase profits of big business			
Curry political favor			
Increase Governmental regimentation			
Other suggested purposes	6	13	10
Aid Europe			
Support farm prices			
Instill fair trades			
Build up business			
Discover people's opinions			
Save food or money			
Help the people			
Don't know purpose	1	26	6
Not ascertained	2	10	4
Number of grocers	160	39	199

1/ Percentages add to more than 100 for some grocers gave more than one purpose. Almost three-fourths of the grocers gave correctly the immediate and specific purpose for which the program was designed -- to stimulate sales of plentiful foods. Very small proportions gave answers that showed they were uninformed. In all, 7 percent suggested antagonism toward the program by the purpose they attributed to it. Only 4 percent, however, mentioned only unfavorable purposes; the other 3 said the program had some other purpose besides helping some special-interest group.

How Successful Did Grocers Think the Program?

Regardless of the purposes they ascribed to the program, only one-fifth of the grocers considered it unqualifiedly successful.

Question: "Now, in general, would you say that the Banner Food Program has been a success or failure around here?"

Said the program was:	<u>Percent</u>
Successful	20
Partly successful - partly failure	30
Failure	40
Undecided or don't know	8
Not ascertained	<u>2</u>
Total	100
Number of grocers	199

The criteria grocers used to measure the success of the program were diverse. Whether or not it increased sales; whether or not it aroused interest; whether or not it helped the housewives, or the storekeepers; whether or not it reduced food prices - all of these were used as measures to evaluate the program's success. Those who thought it was successful said it had stimulated the sales of the bannered foods, had served an educational purpose in teaching housewives how to shop; or had aroused some interest.

Some of the reasons given by grocers who thought the program was a failure are:

"Nobody paid much attention. They felt the Government was just messing around, wasting money, and maybe trying something like price control or rationing."

"My customers buy only what they need -- you can't force people to buy these items."

"Most of the items listed were not considered to be surplus at the time -- and certainly weren't the cheapest. Tomatoes, eggs, asparagus, lettuce, shouldn't be there."

"People were disappointed that prices were not lowered."

"It didn't help me."

"I don't think it had near enough publicity from the standpoint of the housewives."

"...if an article is scarce it tastes better, or if it's hard to get."

Those who thought the program was partially successful said that it had increased sales just a little, had aroused some interest but not much, had received some publicity, helped some people or groups of people, but not others.

A third of the grocers who thought the program was a failure said that nothing could have been done to make it more successful. Half of them said that it might have been more successful if it had been conducted differently.

Question: "Do you think there is anything they could have done to make it more successful?"

Grocers who thought program was a failure and said:	<u>Percent</u>
Something could have been done to make it more successful	51
Nothing could have been done	35
Don't know whether or not anything could have been done	13
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total	100
Number of grocers	79

Among those who considered the program successful or partially successful, there were a few who said that something might have been done to improve it. Roughly in order of the frequency of their mention, here are the suggestions made by grocers who thought the program might have been improved.

Use more publicity, more or more effective advertising
Reduce prices on the plentiful foods
Improve local supervision; include more contact with retail grocers
Select other foods - those locally in surplus
Increase number and variety of foods to be "bannered"
Contact housewives directly
Have private industry, not Government, sponsor program
Use premiums as incentives

How Grocers Measured the Program's Success

Grocers who took part in the program were asked further questions. The replies reveal two of the measures they used in judging whether it was a success or failure.

One measure used was grocers' estimates of the effect of the program on their own business. Opinion of the participators was about equally divided on this question.

Question: "Would you say the program helped your business or not?"

Participating grocers who said that the program:	Percent
Helped business	45
Did not help	49
Uncertain about whether or not it helped	2
Not ascertained	4
Total	100
Number of grocers	160

The grocers who thought their own business had been helped were far more likely to consider the program successful than those who thought it had not helped them personally.

Grocers who participated and said,
that the program:

Evaluation of the program	Helped own business	Did not help business
	Percent	Percent
Success	45	4
Partial success	43	29
Failure	12	63
Uncertain	--	3
Not ascertained	--	1
Total	100	100
Number of grocers	72	79

Another measure used was grocers' estimates of consumer response to the program. Here again opinion was equally divided between those who thought their customers were and those who thought their customers were not interested in the program.

Question: "Do you think your customers were interested in the program or not?"

Participating grocers who said that their customers:	<u>Percent</u>
Were interested in the program	48
Were not interested	48
Didn't know whether or not they were interested	1
Not ascertained	<u>3</u>
Total	100
Number of grocers	160

For the most part, the grocers who said that the Banner Buy Program helped their business also thought their customers were interested in it; those who said it didn't help their business were likely to think their customers were not interested in the program. Grocers who thought their customers were interested were more likely to consider the program a success than those who thought their customers were not interested.

Grocers who participated and
thought that:

Evaluation of the program	<u>Their customers were interested</u>	<u>Were not interested</u>
	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Success	42	3
Partial success	36	37
Failure	20	59
Uncertain	1	1
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>	<u>--</u>
Total	100	100
Number of grocers	76	76

In speaking of the program, two of the kinds of comments made struck at the basis of the program's purposes.

One-fourth of the grocers said, at one time or another during their discussion of the program, that people buy what they want or what they need and therefore foods can't be sold. This kind of comment came out in explanations of the success or failure of the program; in reasons for housewives' lack of interest in it; in discussions of its effect on sales volume; or in explanations of the grocers' own interest or participation.

One-tenth of the grocers said that plentiful foods are not desired -- that people want the scarce foods. This kind of comment appeared most frequently in answers to a rather direct question asked of the merchants who had used the Banner Buy Poster. Their opinions of the poster's slogan, "Buy Plentiful Foods" are indicated:

Question: "Do you think the slogan 'Buy Plentiful Foods' helped or hurt sales of the banner foods?"

Grocers who used the posters and said that the slogan:	<u>Percent</u>
Helped sales	48
Hurt sales	7
Did not affect sales	43
Not ascertained	<u>2</u>
Total	100
Number of grocers	137

One of the men who said that the slogan hurt sales put it this way:

"They should have put on 'Buy Scarce Foods'. If things are plentiful people think -- well, I'll get that tomorrow."

The idea that the plentiful aspect of the foods should not be emphasized was also mentioned in discussions of the program's success, of consumer interest in it, or of sales movements due to it.

Extent of Participation in the Banner Buy Program

Until now the grocers who took any part in the program have been considered as a group. Actually there was great variation in the extent to which retailers participated -- from those whose only activity was to hang a poster in the store window in May to those who gave time and energy to publicizing the program.

How Many Grocers Used the Advertising Materials?

A majority of the participants said they displayed the Banner Buy Posters and the recipe-book posters, and used the banners to mark the featured foods. These materials were distributed to the merchants at the beginning of the program. Very few participants reported that they had not received the placards or the recipe-book posters. The leaflet "Hello Housewives" and the booklet "Use Plentiful Potatoes" which were to have been distributed in June

were less frequently used. Half of the grocers volunteered that they had not seen or received these materials. Less than half reported that they had distributed them.

Participating grocers who said they:

Questions asked about:	Displayed materials Percent	Did not display materials Percent	Did not receive materials Percent	Not ascer- tained Percent	All partici- pants Percent
<u>Basic materials</u>					
"How many of these posters did you use in the store windows?" <u>1/</u>	88	<u>2/</u> 2	<u>1/</u>	4	100
"How many posters did you use inside the store?" <u>1/</u>	82	9	<u>1/</u>	9	100
"How about the recipe-book poster -- did you display that?"	87	3	9	1	100
"Did you use these little banners to mark the plentiful foods?"	81	9	7	3	100
<u>Additional materials</u>					
"Did you distribute the leaflet 'Hello Housewives'?"	46	4	49	1	100
"Did you distribute a booklet about potatoes called 'Use Plentiful Potatoes'?"	43	4	50	3	100
Number of grocers	160				

1/ It was assumed that every grocer who reported taking part would have at least received the posters so no space was left in the questionnaire for a "Did not receive materials" report. It is possible that a few grocers did not receive the posters and may be included in the "Not ascertained" category.

2/ Includes 2 percent of the participants who said they had no store windows in which posters could be placed.

In addition to using the materials provided by the U. S. Department of Agriculture many grocers prepared special displays of the bannered foods during the campaign.

Questions: "Did you make any special window displays of plentiful foods during the campaign?"
"Did you make any special displays inside of the store?"

Participating grocers who said they:	Window display Percent	Inside display Percent
Prepared displays	42	68
Did not prepare displays	<u>1/</u> 56	31
Not ascertained	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	100	100
Number of grocers	160	160

1/ Includes 16 percent who reported they have no display windows.

Their answers to the question: "Would you describe your display?" show that some considered a few cans of peas on the counter a display whereas others prepared simultaneous displays all over the store -- pyramiding canned banner foods, massing "Banner Buys," and putting up streamers pointing to the displays.

Some of the larger stores mentioned the program in their newspaper advertisements. One-fifth of the participating stores reported that they sometimes advertised in the newspapers; not quite half of these men answered in the affirmative the question: "Did you run any newspaper advertising about the campaign?"

Many grocers displayed some of the campaign materials. (See first table on Page 12). Relatively few of them, however, used all of the materials that were to have been made available to them. The following table shows the extent of participation as measured by use of advertising materials, of the grocers who were in the program.

	<u>Participators</u> <u>Percent</u>	<u>Grocers</u> <u>Percent</u>
Grocers reported they:		
A. Did <u>not</u> use all basic materials or did not display in all suggested ways	42	34
B. Used all basic materials in suggested ways	58	46
Used basic materials and--		
C. Prepared displays (in store windows and inside)	24	20
D. Used additional distributed materials	21	16
E. (C + D) Used all basic and additional materials in suggested ways and prepared window and inside displays <u>1/</u>	8	6
Did not take part	--	20
Total	100	100
Number of grocers	160	199

1/ This represents only 13 grocers. In all later tables which show the relation between extent of participation and other data about the grocers, the E group is omitted because it is so small.

The groupings B, C, D, and E are not mutually exclusive. Many of the same grocers who prepared displays (C) may also have distributed leaflets and booklets (D). And all those in groups C, D, and E are included in B. What the table shows is a screening of grocers toward greater participation in the program, it also shows that although no fewer than 8 out of 10 participants used any one of the basic materials provided for the campaign, a much smaller majority (only 58 per cent) used all of them; although no fewer than two-fifths reported using any one material or display, only 8 percent of the grocers in the program did all of these things.

The extent of a grocer's participation in the program cannot be said to measure his attitude toward it or his willingness to cooperate with such a program. Some grocers said they did not even know of the existence of some of the materials; many apparently did not receive all these materials; few had no store windows for posters or displays. There is, however, some relation between grocers' attitudes toward the program and the extent to which they took part in it.

Attitude toward program ^{1/}	Extent of Participation				All participating grocers
	A Pct.	B Pct.	C Pct.	D Pct.	Pct.
Enthusiastic or active	13	33	41	49	25
Not enthusiastic	85	64	56	45	72
Not ascertained	2	3	3	6	3
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Number of grocers	67	93	39	33	160

^{1/} This rating is based on answers to the question: "As far as you are concerned, would you say you took an active interest or did you just go along with the program?" combined with an interviewer's rating of the grocers' attitude toward the program.

The extent to which grocers took part in the program is also related to their estimates of the program's helpfulness. It appears that the more work a grocer put into the campaign, the more likely he was to say that it helped his business.

Question: "Would you say the program helped your business or not?"

Replies	Extent of Participation				All participating grocers
	A Pct.	B Pct.	C Pct.	D Pct.	Pct.
Helped business	33	53	64	70	45
Did not help business	59	43	36	25	49
Undecided	3	1	--	3	2
Not ascertained	5	3	--	2	4
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Number of grocers	67	93	39	33	160

Not only were chain stores more likely than independents to take part in the program, but they were also more likely to have used all the materials. The greater extent of chain-store participation may be due more to the fact that proportionately more of them received all the materials and suggestions than to any greater enthusiasm for the program on their part. This is demonstrated in summary.

Participants reported they had <u>not</u> received following materials:	<u>Chain</u> <u>Percent</u>	<u>Independent</u> <u>cooperative</u> <u>Percent</u>	<u>Independent</u> <u>Percent</u>	<u>All</u> <u>participants</u> <u>Percent</u>
Small banners	2	9	10	7
Recipe book poster	2	4	17	9
Leaflet "Hello Housewives"	30	55	57	49
Booklet "Use Plentiful Potatoes"	32	51	63	50
Number of grocers	44	47	69	160

Whatever the cause, the following table shows the difference in extent of participation in the program of chain and independent stores.

Kind of store: 1/	<u>Extent of Participation</u>				<u>All</u> <u>participants</u>
	<u>A</u> <u>Pct.</u>	<u>B</u> <u>Pct.</u>	<u>C</u> <u>Pct.</u>	<u>D</u> <u>Pct.</u>	<u>Pct.</u>
Chain	14	38	44	59	28
Independent-cooperative	23	33	31	30	29
Independent	63	29	25	21	43
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Number of grocers	67	93	39	33	160

1/ The relative proportion of chain to other types of stores was arbitrarily set (See Sample statement Page 1) and does not purport to represent the actual proportions of these stores in York and Lancaster Counties. Therefore, it would be incorrect to say that 28 percent of the participants were chain stores, 29 percent independents, etc. The significant and correct comparisons are between groups A, B, C, and D, and not within them.

How Widely was the Banner Used?

The basis for the tabulations given in this section are the answers to two questions:

1. "Do you remember what foods you bannered?"
2. "Here is a list of foods that some grocers have bannered. Have you bannered any of these (in addition to the ones you've already told me about)?"

Nine out of ten storekeepers reported at least one food they had bannered during the campaign. A listing of all the foods that were reported shows that many grocers used the banner for foods which were not on the official list selected for the program.

	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Participants who reported that they:		
Bannered some foods during the campaign		91
Bannered only the officially designated foods	45	
Bannered both officially designated and other foods	45	
Bannered only foods which were not officially designated	1	
Did not report what foods they bannered or whether they had bannered any foods		9
Total		100
Number of grocers		160

Although appearing to have been rather widespread, the practice of using the banner to push sales of foods which were not officially selected as plentiful foods was not as great as the above table might indicate. For many grocers just mentioned one or two non-official items while listing many of the foods which had been selected for the program. If the list of foods mentioned is considered, one-fifth of the ones grocers themselves recollected (Question 1 above) were non-official foods. This amounts to about a tenth of all foods reported. It should be noted, however, that the list shown to grocers included only officially selected foods so that there was no opportunity for increasing mention of non-official items.

The following list indicates the extent to which the banner was used by the campaign's participators for the officially designated foods.

<u>Products grocers bannered</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Products grocers bannered</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Canned citrus juice	70	Sweet potatoes	24
Canned peas	67	Fruit spreads	20
Irish potatoes	60	Eggs	19
Canned tomato products	51	Celery	19
Peanut butter	44	Lettuce	19
Fresh citrus fruit	42	Apples	19
Tomatoes	41	Fresh or frozen fish	16
Dried fruit	37	Spinach	14
Apple juice or sauce	34	Honey	12
Canned grapefruit segments	26	Canned purple plums	11
Cabbage	25	Canned pumpkin	8
		Cauliflower	7
		Chickens	4

Number of grocers 160

So far as non-official foods were included, more than 10 percent of the grocers said they used the banner for beans -- baked beans, pork and beans, kidney beans, etc., -- and for canned corn. In addition to these, more than 40 other food or grocery items were mentioned as having been bannered. The list includes such diverse items as soap powder, luncheon meats, prepared puddings, cookies, coffee, and noodles. Finally there was a group of about a dozen items which were so vaguely described - as "fresh vegetables" or "canned fruits" - that it was impossible to classify them as correctly or incorrectly bannered.

The mean average number of items that were bannered during the campaign by those who reported bannering any specific foods was 9; excluding the non-official foods the average was 8.

How Effective was the Program in Increasing Sales of Bannered Foods?

The final answer to the question about the effectiveness of the Banner Buy Food Program could be made only after an audit of the sales of the participating stores in York and Lancaster Counties. But the following tabulation gives some indication that, in general, grocers thought sales of the plentiful foods were increased by the use of the banner: 1/

Participating grocers who bannered some officially designated food and who reported:

	<u>Percent</u>
Increased sales of all foods they bannered	38
Increased sales of some; not of others	31
No increase in sales of any bannered foods	29
Not ascertained	2
Total	100
Number of grocers	144

1/ This tabulation is derived from answers to the question, asked individually about all bannered foods mentioned by the grocer, "Did putting a banner on increase its sales or not?"

The effectiveness ascribed to the banner in increasing sales of the four foods most frequently bannered is suggested in the following table:

Grocers who bannered designated food and who reported:	Foods bannered			
	Citrus juice	Canned peas	White potatoes	Tomato products
	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Increased sales	64	66	55	54
No increase in sales	36	32	43	43
Not ascertained	<u>77</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of grocers	112	107	96	82

The items for which the banner appeared to be least effective in increasing sales include among others, the relatively expensive and less staple foods and the less frequently bannered foods. These foods are: chickens, eggs, honey, lettuce, peanut butter, tomatoes, canned pumpkin, spinach. More grocers thought that sales of these bannered items had not increased than thought they had.

Although the question about increased sales of bannered foods was formulated in terms of, 'did putting a banner on the specific food' affect its sales, there is some evidence that reduced prices of the bannered items also influenced their sales. The relation between the action taken in regard to price and the change in sales volume is summarized in the following tabulation:

Participating grocers who bannered some officially designated food and who reported:	Price action reported:		
	Reduced all prices	Reduced some not others	No prices reduced
	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Increased sales of all bannered foods	53	21	36
Increased sales of some; not others	21	53	16
No increase in sales of bannered foods	21	26	46
Not ascertained	<u>5</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	100	100	100
Number of grocers	57	43	44

Proportionately more grocers who reduced prices on bannered items than those who didn't, reported that they had increased the sales by the use of the banner. The largest proportion of grocers who reported no effect of the banner on sales were those who had taken no action in regard to price on any bannered foods.

Turning again to specific foods, the relation between price action taken and movement of the four main banner foods is shown in the following table:

	<u>Four bannered foods</u>			
	<u>Citrus juice Percent</u>	<u>Canned peas Percent</u>	<u>White potatoes Percent</u>	<u>Tomato products Percent</u>
Reported that they:				
Reduced prices	60	61	51	53
Sales increased	44	45	33	31
No increase in sales	16	14	18	20
Not ascertained	--	2	--	2
Did not reduce prices	40	38	48	46
Sales increased	20	21	22	23
No increase in sales	20	17	25	22
Not ascertained	--	--	1	1
Price action not ascertained	--	1	1	1
Total	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Number of grocers	112	107	96	82

For each food, the grocers who lowered the price were more likely to report increased sales than those who did not.

Bannered items on which fewer grocers lowered than maintained or increased the prices were, cauliflower, chickens, dried fruit, eggs, lettuce, peanut butter, spinach, tomatoes, canned grapefruit segments, and canned pumpkin. The list at the bottom of Page 18 shows that there was considerable overlapping between the foods which the banner didn't move and those on which price adjustments were not made.

